REMARKS

This supplemental response is submitted since Applicant inadvertently did not fully respond to all of the rejections based on 35 USC 103, in particular, the rejections directed to claims 2, 5 and 6.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The arguments with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 9 as being obvious over U.S. 6,459,577 (Holmes et al.) were submitted in the response filed on October 29, 2004.

Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,430,044 (Hutchinson et al.). Applicant directs the Examiner to the response to the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 8 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Hutchinson et al. (filed October 29, 2004). As previously indicated, the device of Hutchinson et al. does not teach a first printed circuit board vertically disposed adjacent to one side of the first hole in the casing structure and substantially parallel to the side of the first hole, as claimed in claim 1. Dependent claims 5 and 6 are directed to the specific dimensions of the claimed invention, and since the reference to Hutchinson et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest all of the claimed elements of claim 1, it is respectfully believed that the rejection of dependent claims 5 and 6 is not supported.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,144,556 (Lanclos). Applicant directs the Examiner to the earlier response filed on October 29, 2004, in regard to the rejection of claims 1, 8, 10 and 11 as being anticipated by Lanclos. As previously indicated, the printed circuit board 115 of

Lanclose is horizontally disposed in the housing 50 which is quite different from the vertically disposed printed circuit board of the claimed invention, as claimed in claim 1. It is respectfully believed that all of the elements of independent claim 1 are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the reference to Lanclos, and therefore it is believed that the rejection of dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 as being unpatentable over Lanclos is not supported.

Claims 2, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. 6,650,539 (Lin et al.). The Examiner is respectfully redirected to the response of October 29, 2004, with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4 and 8-11 as being anticipated by Lin et al. As previously indicated, the reference to Lin does not teach the claimed first printed circuit board vertically disposed adjacent to one side of the first hole in the casing structure and substantially parallel to the side of the first hole, in conjunction with the other claimed elements. Thus, it is respectfully believed that all of the elements of independent claim 1, as presently amended, are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the single reference to Lin et al., and therefore the rejection of dependent claims 2, 5 and 6 as being unpatentable over Lin et al. cannot be maintained.

In view of the remarks above, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims based on 35 USC 103 is respectfully requested.

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art individually or collectively shows the invention as claimed. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims appears to be warranted and the same is respectfully requested. In the event there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application which can

3

be resolved by a telephone call or facsimile communication to Applicant's Attorney, the

Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone or facsimile at the numbers

provided below.

Respectfully submitted,
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

WONKI K. PARK
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,991

Date: November 30, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Telephone: 703-683-0500
Facsimile: 703-683-1080

WP/jrs
S:\Producer\wp\LEE 661676\supplemental response.wpd

4